```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 8
                            DISTRICT OF OREGON
 9
                             PORTLAND DIVISION
10
11
   JAMES ARTHUR ROSS,
                                                    No. 3:09-cv-01530-HU
12
                                                       OPINION AND ORDER
              Plaintiff,
13
        VS.
14
   MARK NOOTH, et al.,
15
              Defendants.
16
17
  James Arthur Ross
   State ID No. 12599830
  Eastern Oregon Correctional Institute
2500 Westgate
19 Pendleton, OR 97801
20
        Plaintiff Pro Se
21 John R. Kroger
   Attorney General
22 Michael R. Washington
   Senior Assistant Attorney General
23 Department of Justice
   1162 Court Street NE
24 Salem, OR 97301-4096
   Telephone: (503) 947-4700
  Facsimile: (503) 947-4791
25
26
        Of Attorneys for Defendants
27
28
     - OPINION AND ORDER
```

Case 3:09-cv-01530-MO Document 113 Filed 09/07/12 Page 1 of 4

HUBEL, J.,

2 - OPINION AND ORDER

In this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 case, plaintiff James Arthur Ross 2 3 ("Plaintiff"), an inmate at the Snake River Correctional Institution ("SCRI") in Ontario, Oregon, filed a document entitled "Plaintiff's Motion in Opposition to the Defendants' Response to 5 Plaintiff's Second Request for Production" on August 1, 2012. Eight days later, on August 9, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to respond to Defendants' currently pending motion for summary judgment. Because the Court construed Plaintiff's August 1 filing as a motion to compel production, a 11 telephone status conference was held August 23, 2012, in order to 12 discuss the parties' respective positions on the matter. At that 13 hearing, Defendants were given until August 31, 2012 to respond to 14 Plaintiff's motion to compel and Plaintiff's motion for 15 extension of time was granted in part: "The [C]ourt will extend the 16 deadline to a date certain after its ruling on [P]laintiff's motion 17 to compel." (Record of Proceedings and Order (Docket No. 109) at 1.) 18 19 Having reviewed the motion to compel, as well as all materials 20 filed in support and in opposition thereto, the Court DENIES 21 Plaintiff's motion (Docket No. 104) to compel production of 22 documents. Plaintiff's August 1 motion concerns Request No. 6 of 23 his second request production, which sought: "Copies of the 24 ventilation, heating and air conditioning ducts for Snake River 25 Correctional Institution. More specifically, for complexes 1, 2, 26 3 and segregation." (Defs.' Resp. (Docket No. 111) at 2.) 27 Plaintiff seeks the blueprints of the heating, ventilation, and air 28 conditioning ("HVAC") system at SRCI to prove that Defendants

retaliated against him when they moved him from honor housing to complex three based on Plaintiff's complaint of fumes in the honor housing unit, because the move would have subjected him to the same fumes he experienced in honor housing (i.e., Plaintiff believes there is only one HVAC system for the main institution complex and the honored housing complex at SRCI).

Defendants objected to Request No. 6 "on the grounds it is overbroad, irrelevant, and producing the confidential material requested would pose a security threat to the institution." The Court agrees that the request is overbroad based on the purpose for which it is sought and that production of such material could pose a serious security threat at SRCI. See Procunier v. Superior Court, 35 Cal. App. 3d 211, 212 (1973). Thus, I am denying Plaintiff's motion to compel; however, I will treat Paragraph 4 of the Declaration of Jamie Miller filed by Defendants, which 16 indicates that there are "two entirely separate HVAC systems for the two complexes" at issue, as an answer denying an interrogatory from Plaintiff asking if the HVAC system supplying air to the honor housing unit and to complex three (3) are one in the same such that inmates in each facility breathe air from the same source.

Plaintiff must respond to Defendants' currently pending motion for summary judgment by October 15, 2012, and Defendants' reply memorandum is due by November 1, 2012.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

2.5

5

7

11

13

15

18

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

Dated this 7th day of September, 2012. /s/ Dennis J. Hubel Dennis J. Hubel United States Magistrate Judge 4 - OPINION AND ORDER